



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—CULEX 367, 8 AND CIRIS 66.

Hic Curius clarae socius uirtutis et ille
Flaminius deuota dedit qui corpora flammae.

The difficulty of 368 is well known. No Flaminius is recorded whose history suits the poet's description. Hence the most desperate remedies have been resorted to, none, perhaps, more improbable than the view lately propounded by Professor Housman, *Cl. Rev.* XVI. p. 339 that the poet wrote:

Graminibus deuincta gerit qui tempora Flamma

and alluded to M. Calpurnius Flamma, who, as military tribune in the first Punic war rivalled the exploit of Leonidas at Thermopylae by occupying with 300 volunteers a height surrounded by the enemy and so rescued his army. *Liv.* XXII. 60. 11; *Plin.* XXII. 11; *Ampel.* 20; *Liv. Perioch.* 17. Flamma was rewarded by a crown of grass, as Pliny records.

The story is told at great length by A. Gellius *N. A.* III 7, who however states the number of volunteers at 400 (not 300), and names the tribune Q. Caedicius, or (according to Claudius Quadrigarius) Laberius. Cato, however, from whom Gellius draws his narrative and from whom he quotes a long passage, expressly states that this heroic act was little known and had received a very small amount of recognition. Cato contrasts the obscurity of the Roman tribune with the fame of the Greek Leonidas. 'Leonides Laco, qui simile apud Thermopylas fecit, propter eius uirtutes omnis Graecia gloriam atque gratiam praecipuam claritudinis inclitissimae decorauere monumentis: signis, statu, elogiis, historiis, aliisque rebus gratissimum id eius factum habuere: at tribuno militum parua laus pro factis relict, qui idem fecerat atque rem seruauerat'.

The act being thus obscure, it is hardly likely that its hero would be combined with Curius; and still less can the rest of Prof. Housman's emendation be admitted, leaving, as it does, out of six words, only one unaltered and even that one with a slight change of inflexion, Flamma instead of flammae.

In its general outline the passage looks as if it ought to refer to L. Caecilius Metellus, who when pontifex maximus, saved the palladium when the temple of Vesta was on fire, and in the effort

lost his own eyes. The references to this story are frequent and almost a commonplace of Roman literature. Nicolas Loensis (in Gruter's *Lampas* v. 636 sqq.) quotes Ov. *Fast.* VI. 437-456, Plin. H. N. VII. 141, Plut. *Parall.* 17, Liv. *Perioch.* 19, to which Cic. *Scaur.* §47 and many others might be added. Among these, two call for special attention, partly as occurring in rather out of the way writers, partly as throwing a more or less direct light on the passage of the Culex.

The first of these is Dionys. *Antiqq.* II. 66. Dionysius, after stating that the temple of Vesta was burnt during the first Carthaginian war, continues thus: ἐμπρησθέντος γὰρ τοῦ τεμένους καὶ τῶν παρθένων φεугουσῶν ἐκ τοῦ πυρός τῶν ἱεροφαντῶν τις Λεύκιος Καϊκίλιος ὁ καλούμενος Μέτελλος, ἀνὴρ ὑπατικός, ὁ τὸν αἰοιδιμον ἐκ Σικελίας ἀπὸ Καρχηδονίων καταγαγὼν ὀκτὼ καὶ τριάκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν ἐλεφάντων θρίαμβον, ὑπεριδὼν τῆς ἰδίας ἀσφαλείας τοῦ κοινῇ συμφέροντος ἔνεκα παρεκινδύνευσεν εἰς τὰ καϊόμενα βιάσασθαι καὶ τὰ καταλειφθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν παρθένων ἀρπάσας ἱερὰ διέσωσεν ἐκ τοῦ πυρός. ἐφ' ᾧ τιμὰς παρὰ τῆς πόλεως ἐξηνέγκατο μεγάλας, ὡς ἡ τῆς εἰκόνης αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐν Καπετωλίῳ γενομένης ἐπιγραφὴ μαρτυρεῖ. Here (1) Caecilius is called ἱεροφαντῶν τις. (2) His victories in Sicily made him famous. (3) His exploit in saving the sacred things was rewarded by a statue with an inscription on the Capitol. (4) Nothing is said of his losing his eyes in the attempt.

Each of these points bears on our discussion.

1. Metellus is called one of the pontifices: this seems strange if he was pontifex maximus. Dionysius seems to say in II. 73 that 'hierophant' was *his* word for pontifex: and C. Papirius is called by him III 36 ἀνὴρ ἱεροφάντης. It would seem that in the account of the story known to Dionysius, Metellus was mentioned only as one of the body of pontifices, not as pontifex maximus.

2 and 3. His fame on three grounds, as obtainer of a splendid triumph, as hero of a religious enterprise of the highest national importance, and as distinguished by a statue on the Capitol, quite justifies his being ranked in the poem with Curius.

4. The absence of any mention of eyes both in Dionysius and the poem may perhaps point to both writers following a common version, which made no mention of Metellus losing his eyes in rescuing the Palladium: *deuota dedit qui corpora flammae.*

The second passage is from the elder Seneca, *excerpta controversiarum* IV. 2 (p. 380 ed. Bursian). In this controversia, of which a short abstract alone has survived, the blinding of

Metellus was taken as the basis of the various points which the situation suggested to the declaimer. Prefixed to it is the following lemma: 'Sacerdos integer sit. Metellus pontifex cum arderet Vestae templum, dum Palladium rapit, oculos perdidit. Sacerdotium illi negatur'. One of the requirements for holding the office of pontifex was a sound body. Metellus lost his sight in the flames and therefore could no longer be pontifex. This is the point on which the latter part of the epitomated controversia dwells, and it has a direct bearing on the line of the Culex. For the chief reason which has interfered to prevent Metellus being considered the person alluded to in that line is the substitution of *corpora* for what would have been expected, *lumina*. This substitution *may* find its explanation, as I said above, in a version of the story which said nothing about the blindness. But it may also be explained, and with more probability, in reference to the requirement in a pontifex of a sound body, with no imperfection of limbs; *deuota dedit qui corpora flammae*. For *corpora* applied to a single body, like Greek σώματα, see my note on Ibis 412: it is indeed very commonly so used.

This brings me to the most difficult part of the inquiry, the word *Flam(m)inius*. So far as I know, this has hitherto been universally supposed to be a proper name. I suggest that it may have a different reference, namely to the word *flamen* with its derivatives *flaminicus*, *flaminium*. It is perhaps hardly likely that *Flaminicus* which is glossed (Götz, Thesaurus glossarum emendatarum p. 456) as *ιερεὺς Καίσαρος* should take the place of the proper name which would naturally be combined with Curius in the sense of a holder of priestly office, but it seems not impossible that the office of flamen (*flaminium*) should be used as = *sacerdotium* with specific application to a case where possibly the etymology of the word (*flamen* connected with *φλέγειν*), more certainly its connection with fire (*flamines πυρεῖς* and see the other glosses of the word in Götz all pointing to *πῦρ*) made such an application legitimate and intelligible. I would write therefore:

Flaminio deuota dedit qui corpora flammae,

constructing the dative *Flaminio* with *deuota*, 'the hero who devoted his body to his priestly function and delivered it to the flame', thereby endangering his claim to retain his priestly office, owing to the damage his body had sustained.

[After this was written, I read O. Lenze's paper in Philologus LXIV. 95 sqq. in which the writer argues that the story of

Metellus' blinding was no part of the original legend, but a late accretion, dating from the period when such stories were worked up by the schools of declamation, probably not much before the Augustan era. His arguments do not appear to me convincing, but my own positions are scarcely affected by them. It is enough for my purpose that the act of Metellus was accompanied by a *bodily* injury which enhanced its heroism. And in any case the *Culex* was written at a time when the legend was sufficiently old to have assumed many variations].

Ciris 66.

Ipse † gratinei matrem sed siue † erithei (*al.* erichthei)
Siue illam monstro genuit graeuena biformi
Siue est neutra parens.

The second of these verses I have already discussed in A. J. P. XV 471. It is on the verse before it that I now offer a suggestion.

The corruption is in two names, the former of which has been satisfactorily emended by Heyne from Od. μ 124, Κράταιν Μητέρα τῆς Σκύλλης into *Crataein ait*; the latter *erithei*, for which Nicolas Loensis conjectured *Crataeis*, can hardly be considered solved, though since its first promulgation, the conjecture has generally been accepted as right. To me it seems improbable, not to say impossible. Whence comes the *e*, so wholly absent from *gratin*, in which no one doubts *Crataein* to be concealed?

Apollonius Rhodius IV. 826, 7 speaking of Scylla describes her parentage thus:

Σκύλλης Ἀῖσωνίης ὀλοόφρονος ἦν τέκε Φόρκῳ
Νυκτιπόλοσ 'Εκάτη τήν τε κλείουσι Κράταιν

from which it appears that Scylla was the daughter of Phorkos and Hekate, a goddess widely known under another name as Krataeis. This double name of the goddess, Hekate or Krataeis, the poet of the *Ciris*, recondite in his learning and widely read in Greek poetry, appears to me to have expressed in the verse before us, and I suggest that for *erithei* we should write, retaining the *e*, (*H*)*ecateis*. The meaning would thus be, 'Homer himself says Scylla's mother was Krataeis, but whether she was daughter of Hekate (i. e. the same mother under her other name), or whether she was the offspring of a sea-monster, or lastly was not progenerated of either, she deserves to be recorded as a heroine of unusual celebrity'.

ROBINSON ELLIS.